

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,895	06/22/2006	Yang-Soo Park	4555-0111PUS1	1739
2292 BIRCH STEW	7590 11/02/201 'ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAM	EXAMINER	
PO BOX 747			CHRISS, JENNIFER A	
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1786		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail $\,$ address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/583,895	PARK ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JENNIFER A. CHRISS	1786		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

- 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 20 October 2010. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMEN	DN	IEN	TS

- 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
- The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
- non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) x will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:

Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) rejected: 1.4.11 and 12. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ___

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See continuation sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: .

/JAC/

/Jennifer A Chriss/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1786 11. Regarding the foreign priority document, the Examiner acknowledges the request to retrieve electronic priority application was received by the Office on February 19, 2010. The Examiner considers this request sufficient to obtain the cartified priority document. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Lee et al. teach a composite yarm made of an effect yarm and a core yarm which is used as the warp and/or welt of a woven fabric (see rejection dated 4/21/10). Therefore, the composite yarm can be present in both the warp and welf of the woven fabric. Therefore, the warp contains the effect yarm as properly construed by Applicant which has a monofilament fineness of 0.00 to 0.3. However, Applicant agues that the effect yarm or "warp yarm" of Lee is air texturized while the yarm as claimed by Applicant is false-twisted. The Examiner submits that the claim does not require that it is false twisted but rather can be a polyester multiment or (emphasis) its false twist yarm. Therefore, an air texturized yarm can properly read on a polyester multifilament consisting of ultra fine yarms. Additionally, Applicant argument that Lee teaches that the core yarm is not required that its definess. If should be noted that the ore yarm is an equivalent to Applicant's "welt yarm" but rather the effect yarm which Lee has noted can also be in the welf direction. The core yarm as an orbed by the Office Action has a fineness of 0.001 to 0.3 denier. The Examiner submits that the claimed limitations have been met.